

Economic Forecast for Current Year

concealed this document and that it should have been published by the previous government at the time. Let the minister answer that.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is rising really to explain a misinterpretation, which he may do at the conclusion of the remarks of the minister. It is not a question of privilege that arises in the course of debate.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, if I am guilty of an error in saying that the hon. member shared those views I think the place he should ask the correction to be made is of the hon. member for Essex East, because he was the one who indicated that he and his friend the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate both took this view.

The point, however, is this. At least one of those hon. gentlemen, a leading member of the opposition party, has stated in the course of his remarks that in their view this was a wrong thing to do, that it was a wrong practice.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is not the position you took.

Mr. Fulton: What are they now asking to do except that, by this motion, one mistake should become the practice? Could anything be more cynical than that?

Mr. Pickersgill: What the Prime Minister did was much more cynical.

Mr. Fulton: In the view of hon. members opposite this was a bad thing. It should not have been done when it was done. Now they want to make it a practice in this house. They want to perpetuate a mistake. When I say "they" I refer to hon. gentlemen opposite. That is what they are asking this house to do. Well, sir, this house and the country learned the danger of perpetuating mistakes back in 1957 and they put the Liberals over there on the other side of the house so that mistakes would not be perpetuated any longer.

Mr. Pickersgill: You are concealing a document the Prime Minister accused us of concealing. That is what you were doing.

Mr. Fulton: Let me make it clear again, that I am discussing their view when I say it is submitted it was a mistake.

Mr. Pickersgill: How about discussing the Prime Minister's view?

Mr. Fulton: We, of course, as I said earlier, did not say it was a mistake under the circumstances under which it was done.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let us have the reports, then.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Fulton: The difference between that circumstance and this is that when the other document was tabled it was tabled many months after it was published.

Mr. Pickersgill: And we were accused of hiding it.

Mr. Fulton: The report was tabled many months after it was first made.

Mr. McGee: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We have just witnessed again these two arrogant gentlemen sprawling in their seats interrupting freely and at will the hon. member who has the floor. Surely that is contrary to the rules of the house.

Mr. Pigeon: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Justice has the floor. The minister is entitled to make his argument. I find it difficult to follow because of interruptions.

Mr. Crestohl: These juvenile backbenchers.

Mr. Speaker: There have been interjections from both sides of the house. I invite hon. members to give the minister who has but a few minutes, a clear opportunity to present his argument.

Mr. Pickersgill: There is very little argument.

Mr. Fulton: I am nearly through, Mr. Speaker. I have only the following two points to make. The hypothetical or alleged document the production of which is now sought would, if it existed, be current. That results inevitably from the terms of the hon. member's resolution.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is being hidden.

Mr. Fulton: The hon. member in his resolution asked for the production of the most recent in an alleged series of documents. The hon. gentleman seeks the production of a current document which he well knows—

Mr. Pickersgill: Which the Prime Minister said we hid.

Mr. Fulton: —it is not the practice to produce, for reasons which he also well knows; whereas the production of the other document on the previous occasion was the production of a document which was no longer current. Therefore the two circumstances are entirely different.

But third, Mr. Speaker, my colleague has said that there is no such document. Therefore my argument may be summarized as follows.

First, there is no such document. Second, there is no precedent for its production, even if such a document existed. Third, since it is perfectly obvious that all we